



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/592,741	06/13/2000	Theresa M. Gosko	M-9083-US	7322
33438	7590	11/18/2005	EXAMINER	
HAMILTON & TERRILE, LLP			FISCHER, ANDREW J	
P.O. BOX 203518			ART UNIT	
AUSTIN, TX 78720			PAPER NUMBER	
			3627	

DATE MAILED: 11/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/592,741

Applicant(s)

GOSKO, THERESA M.

Examiner

Andrew J. Fischer

Art Unit

3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 August 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-9 and 30-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-9 and 30-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 C.F.R. §1.114***

1. A request for continued examination (“RCE”) under 37 C.F.R. §1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 C.F.R. §1.17(e), was filed in this application on April 6, 2005. This application was under a final rejection (the Second Final Office Action, mailed October 25, 2004) and is therefore eligible for continued examination under 37 C.F.R. §1.114. Because the fee set forth in 37 C.F.R. §1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality in the Second Final Office Action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.114.

### ***Acknowledgements***

2. In accordance with the RCE noted above, Applicant’s amendment filed August 31, 2005 has been entered. Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 4-9, and 30-39 remain pending.

3. This Office Action, the “Third Non Final Office Action” is given Paper No. 20051106.

4. All references in this Office Action to the capitalized versions of “Applicant” refers specifically the Applicant of record. References to lower case versions of “applicant” or “applicants” refers to any or all patent “applicants.” Unless expressly noted otherwise, references to “Examiner” in this Office Action refers to the Examiner of record while reference to or use of the lower case version of “examiner” or “examiners” refers to examiner(s) generally.

5. This Office Action is written in OACS. Because of this, the Examiner is unable to control formatting, paragraph numbering, font, spelling, line spacing, and/or other word processing issues. The Examiner sincerely apologies for these errors.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph***

6. The following is a quotation of the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 1, 2, 4-9, and 30-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims are replete with errors. Some examples follow.

a. In claim 1, it is unclear if “a computer readable media” as recited in line 8 is the same or different from “a computer readable media” as recited in lines 1 and 2.

b. Also in claim 1, it is unclear if “a computer readable media” as recited in line 15 is the same or different from “a computer readable media” as recited in lines 1 and 2 or even “a computer readable media” as recited in line 1. The Examiner highly recommends Applicant review all pending claims for issues similar to this issue.

c. In claim 30, it is unclear if “a computer readable media” as recited in line 9 is the same or different from “a computer readable media” as recited in line 1.

d. Also in claim 30, it is unclear if “an entire catalog” a recited in line 7 is the same or different from “a catalog” as recited in line 2. The Examiner highly recommends Applicant review all pending claims for issues similar to this issue.

e. Claim 4-7 and 31 are indefinite.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102***

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. §102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office Action:

Art Unit: 3627

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States. . . .

(c) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9. Claims 1, 2, 4-9, and 30-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Johnson et. al. (U.S. 6,055,515) (“Johnson ‘515”). Johnson ‘515 discloses a computer readable medium in combination with a data structure.

10. Because a medium is a physical tangible entity, it is the Examiner’s factual determination that Applicant has now claimed a product. Product claims are patentable for what they are, not what they do. See *e.g. In re Benner*, 174 F.2d 938, 942, 82 USPQ 49, 53 (CCPA 1949) (“no provision has been made in the patent statutes for granting a patent upon an old product based solely upon discovery of a new use for such product”). Because data structures *by definition* can not “do” anything (*i.e.* it is a *computer program* is the item or thing that actually *performs* actions), Applicants claims are simply a medium and a data structure. Because virtually all computer programs when executed are on a medium, and those medium contain data structures, the claims are anticipated by a large number of documents. Johnson ‘515 is simply selected as being exemplary of these documents.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103***

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. §103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office Action:

Art Unit: 3627

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 1, 2, 4-9, and 30-39 are alternatively rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson '515 in view of Muller, Gralla, and Danish et. al.'s Building Database-Driven Web Catalogs ("Danish").<sup>1</sup> It is the Examiner's principle position that the claims are anticipated because Applicant claims only a medium and data structure. Moreover, a catalog record header portion is inherent in the catalog of Johnson '515.

However if not inherent, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Johnson '515 as taught by Danish to include Danish's use of headers. Such a modification would have disclosed that which is old and well known in the art.

13. In this rejection, Muller is cited simply to show an exemplary data structure such as web structures in an EDI environment (Page 83-86) which are old and well known in the art. Clearly one of ordinary skill in the art recognizes that EDI uses header portions (see *e.g.* Sokol, EDI, the Competitive Edge). Gralla is cited simply to show how the world wide web works. *E.g.*, see Part 5, How the World Wide Web Works.

14. For due process purposes, because Applicant has not objectively indicated and redefined claim limitation(s) to have meanings other than their ordinary and accustomed meanings, and except for the term "system type element," the Examiner confirms that Applicant has decided not to be her own lexicographer. To support this position, the Examiner again notes the following

---

<sup>1</sup> See MPEP §2112 expressly authorizing alternative §102/§103 rejections when the question of inherency is present in the anticipation rejection.

Art Unit: 3627

factual findings as first discussed in the previous Office Actions. First, the Examiner has again carefully reviewed the specification and prosecution history and (except for the term “system type element”), can not locate any lexicographic definition(s). Second, the Examiner finds that not only has Applicant not pointed to definitional statements in her specification or prosecution history, Applicant has also not pointed to a term or terms in a claim with which to draw in those statements<sup>2</sup> with the required clarity, deliberateness, and precision.<sup>3</sup> Third, after receiving express notice of the Examiner’s position that lexicography is *not* invoked, Applicant’s responses have not pointed out the “supposed errors” in the Examiner’s position regarding lexicography invocation in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.111(b) (*i.e.* Applicant did not argue lexicography *was* invoked). Forth and to be sure of Applicant’s intent, the Examiner also notes that Applicant has declined the Examiner’s express invitation<sup>4</sup> to be her own lexicographer. Finally, after receiving express notice of the preceding factual findings and conclusions,

---

<sup>2</sup> “In order to overcome this heavy presumption in favor of the ordinary meaning of claim language, it is clear that a party wishing to use statements in the written description to confine or otherwise affect a patent’s scope must, *at the very least*, point to a term or terms in the claim with which to draw in those statements. [Emphasis added.]” *Johnson Worldwide Assocs. v. Zebco Corp.*, 175 F.3d 985, 989, 50 USPQ2d 1607, 1610 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

<sup>3</sup> “The patentee’s lexicography must, of course, appear ‘with reasonable clarity, deliberateness, and precision’ before it can affect the claim.” *Renishaw PLC v. Marposs Societa’ per Azioni*, 158 F.3d 1243, 1249, 48 USPQ2d 1117, 1121 (Fed. Cir. 1998) citing *In re Paulsen*, 30 F.3d 1475, 1480, 31 USPQ2d 1671, 1674 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

<sup>4</sup> See *e.g. Fuji Photo Film Co. v. ITC*, 386 F.3d 1095, 72 USPQ2d 1769, 1773 (Fed. Cir. 2004) (noting that applicants’ failure to correct the examiner’s characterization of an element of claim interpretation is nevertheless an indication of how a claim should be interpreted since applicant declined the examiner’s express invitation to correct a possible error in claim interpretation: “applicant’s attention was called to the examiner’s interpretation of [how the element was interpreted by the examiner, and] applicant was invited to correct the examiner’s interpretation—an invitation the applicant did not accept.”

Art Unit: 3627

Applicant's latest response again fails to point out the supposed errors in the Examiner's position regarding lexicography invocation in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.111(b). Moreover, Applicant's latest response—while fully considered by the Examiner—has not changed the Examiner's reasonable conclusion that Applicant has decided not to be her own lexicographer. Therefore (and except for the term "system type element"), the heavy presumption in favor of the ordinary and accustomed meaning for claim terminology is again confirmed. Accordingly, the claims continue to be interpreted with their "broadest reasonable interpretation," *In re Morris*, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027 (Fed. Cir. 1997), and the Examiner continues to rely heavily and extensively on this interpretation.<sup>5</sup>

15. Under the broadest reasonable interpretation standard noted above and unless expressly modified in this Office Action, the Examiner maintains his interpretations including the statements and/or definitions of claim limitations as noted in previous Office Action. Those previous definitions are part of the administrative record and, in accordance with *In re Morris*, are provided simply as a factual source to support the Examiner's claim interpretations (and ultimately the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences claim interpretations if necessary<sup>6</sup>) during ex parte examination.

---

<sup>5</sup> See 37 C.F.R. §1.104(c)(3) which states in part: "the examiner may rely upon admissions by applicant . . . as to *any matter* affecting patentability . . . . [Emphasis added.]"

<sup>6</sup> See *Gechter v. Davidson*, 116 F.3d 1454, 1460, 43 USPQ2d 1030, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1997) ("[W]e hold that the Board is required to set forth in its opinions specific findings of fact and conclusions of law adequate to form a basis for our review.").



***Response to Arguments***

16. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

17. Because "a medium" is a physical, tangible entity (*e.g.* a hard drive, s floppy drive, etc.) which literally can be held or touched and because Applicant now claims at least in part "a medium," the claims are statutory for §101 purposes.

***Conclusion***

18. References considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure are listed on form PTO-892.

All references listed on form PTO-892 are cited in their entirety.

19. The following three (3) citations to the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure ("MPEP") apply to this Office Action: MPEP citations to Chapters 200-900, 1200-1400, and 1700-1900, 2100, 2200, 2600 are from the MPEP 8<sup>th</sup> Edition, Rev. 3, August 2005. MPEP citations to Chapters 100, 1000, 1100, 1500, 2000, 2500, and 2700 are from the MPEP 8<sup>th</sup> Edition, Rev. 2, May 2004. MPEP citations to Chapters 1600, 2300, 2400 are from MPEP 8<sup>th</sup> Edition, August 2001.

20. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 3627

21. Applicant is reminded that patents are written by and for skilled artisans. See *Vivid Technologies, Inc. v. American Science and Engineering, Inc.*, 200 F.3d 795, 804, 53 USPQ2d 1289, 1295 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (“patents are written by and for skilled artisans”). The Examiner therefore starts with the presumption that Applicant is a skilled artisan who possess at least ordinary skill in the art. Consequently, it is the Examiner’s position that because the patent references of record are directed to those with ordinary skill in this art, these references are clear, explicit, and specific as to what they teach. Nevertheless some applicants apparently have difficulty understanding the references. In an effort to maintain compact prosecution, provide due process, and to help these applicants understand the contents of a reference when viewed from the position of one of ordinary skill in this art, Applicant is hereby given actual notice that if after reasonably reading any reference of record, if Applicant can not reasonably understand or if Applicant has difficulty comprehending one or more sentence(s), statement(s), diagram(s), or principle(s) set forth in one or more of the reference(s) of record, Applicant should (in her next appropriately filed response) bring this issue to the attention of the Examiner. In addition to bringing this issue to the attention of the Examiner, and in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.111(b), Applicant’s response must also state *why* they either do not understand or have difficulty comprehending the reference. If after properly receiving (*i.e.* Applicant’s response is made of record) both Applicant’s request for understanding and the reasons as to *why* the request is made—and assuming the reference is germane to at least one outstanding rejection—the Examiner may either provide a substitute reference, or alternatively, do his best to elucidate the particular sentence(s), statement(s), diagram(s), or principles(s) at issue in a reasonable manner.

Art Unit: 3627

22. Also in accordance with *In re Lee*, 277 F.3d 1338, 1344-45, 61 USPQ2d 1430, 1434-35 (Fed. Cir. 2002), the Examiner finds that the reference Building Database-Driven Web Catalogs by Sherif Danish and Patrick Gannon (hereinafter “Danish”) is additional evidence of what is basic knowledge or common sense to one of ordinary skill in this art. The Examiner finds that Danish is a textbook that is about implementing a system for managing and publishing product information. Moreover, because the reference’s general description of web based catalogs and the architecture for such a system, because “[w]ell known text books in English are obvious research materials,” *In re Howarth*, 654, F.2d 103, 210 USPQ 689, 692 (CCPA 1981), and after further review of the entire record including the prior art now of record in conjunction with the factors as discussed in MPEP §2141.03 (where practical), the Examiner finds that Danish is primarily directed towards those of low skill in this art. Because Danish is directed towards those of low skill in this art, the Examiner finds that one of ordinary skill in this art must—at the very least—be aware of and understand the knowledge and information contained within Danish.

23. In accordance with the USPTO’s goals of customer service, compact prosecution, and reduction of cycle time, the Examiner has made every effort to clarify his position regarding claim interpretation and any rejections or objections in this application. Furthermore, the Examiner has again provided Applicant with notice—for due process purposes—of his position regarding his factual determinations and legal conclusions. The Examiner notes and thanks Applicant for her “Remarks” (beginning on page 6) traversing the Examiner’s positions on various points. If Applicant disagrees with any additional factual determination or legal

Art Unit: 3627

conclusion made by the Examiner in this Office Action whether expressly stated or implied,<sup>7</sup> the Examiner respectfully reminds Applicant to properly traverse the Examiner's position(s) in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.111(b) in his next properly filed response. By addressing these issues now, matters where the Examiner and Applicant agree can be eliminated allowing the Examiner and Applicant to focus on areas of disagreement (if any) with the goal towards allowance in the shortest possible time. If Applicant has any questions regarding the Examiner's positions or has other questions regarding this communication or even previous communications, Applicant is strongly encouraged to contact Examiner Andrew J. Fischer whose telephone number is (571) 272-6779. If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's immediate supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski, can be reached at (571) 272-6771. The fax number for facsimile responses is now (571) 273-8300.



Andrew J. Fischer  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3627

AJF  
November 6, 2005

---

<sup>7</sup> E.g., if the Examiner rejected a claim under §103 with two references, although not directly stated, it is the Examiner's implied position that the references are analogous art.